arXiv:1408.5847v1 [math.AP] 25 Aug 2014

AN INITIAL-BOUNDARY VALUE PROBLEM IN A STRIP FOR TWO-DIMENSIONAL ZAKHAROV–KUZNETSOV–BURGERS EQUATION

ANDREI V. FAMINSKII

Abstract. An initial-boundary value problem in a strip with homogeneous Dirichlet boundary conditions for two-dimensional Zakharov–Kuznetsov–Burgers equation is considered. Results on global well–posedness and long-time decay of solutions in H^s for $s \in [0,2]$ are established.

1. Introduction. Description of main results

The goal of this paper is to study global well-posedness and large-time decay of solutions for an initial-boundary value problem on a strip $\Sigma = \mathbb{R} \times (0,L) = \{(x,y) : x \in \mathbb{R}, 0 < y < L\}$ of a given width L for an equation

$$u_t + u_{xxx} + u_{xyy} + uu_x - \delta(u_{xx} + u_{yy}) = 0, \qquad \delta = \text{const} > 0, \tag{1.1}$$

with an initial condition

$$u(0,x,y) = u_0(x,y), \qquad (x,y) \in \Sigma, \tag{1.2}$$

and homogeneous Dirichlet boundary conditions

$$u(t,x,0) = u(t,x,L) = 0, \qquad (t,x) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}. \tag{1.3}$$

This equation is referred as Zakharov–Kuznetsov–Burgers equation because it originates from Zakharov–Kuznetsov equation

$$u_t + u_{xxx} + u_{xyy} + uu_x = 0$$

supplemented with parabolic terms as in Burgers equation. Zakharov–Kuznetsov equation is a multi-dimensional generalization of Korteweg–de Vries equation

$$u_t + u_{xxx} + uu_x = 0$$

and is considered as a model equation for non-linear waves propagating in dispersive media in the preassigned direction x with deformations in the transverse direction y. For the first time it was derived in [16] for ion-acoustic waves in magnetized plasma. Equation (1.1) can be treated as as a model equation for non-linear wave processes including both dispersion and dissipation.

The theory of well-posedness for Zakharov–Kuznetsov equation is most developed for the initial value problem and for initial-boundary value problems on domains of a type $I \times \mathbb{R}$, where I is an interval (bounded or unbounded) on the

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 35Q53; Secondary 35D30.

Key words and phrases. Zakharov–Kuznetsov equation, Burgers equation, initial-boundary value problem, weak solutions, decay.

The work was supported by Project 333, State Assignment in the field of scientific activity implementation of Russia.

variable x, that is the variable y varies in the whole line (see, for example, references in [7, 14]).

However, it seems more natural from the physical point of view to consider domains, where the variable y varies in a bounded interval. In fact, it turned out that it is more difficult to study such problems than the aforementioned ones and there are only a few results on the matter.

In [12] an initial-boundary value problem for Zakharov–Kuznetov equation in the strip Σ with periodic boundary conditions is considered and local well-posedness result is established in the spaces H^s for $s > 3/2$. Initial-boundary value problems in the strip Σ with homogeneous boundary conditions of different types: Dirichlet, Neumann or periodic are studied in [2] and results on global existence and uniqueness in classes of weak solutions with power weights at $+\infty$ are established. For Dirichlet boundary conditions these results are supplemented in [7] with results of exponential long-time decay of small solutions in L_2 spaces with exponential weights at $+\infty$. In [9, 10] an initial-boundary value problem in a half-strip $\mathbb{R}_+ \times (0, L)$ with homogeneous Dirichlet boundary conditions is studied and global well-posedness in spaces L_2 and H^1 with exponential weights when $x \to +\infty$ as well as exponential decay as $t \to +\infty$ of small solutions are proved. For a bounded rectangle global well-posedness results can be found in [6, 14] and exponential long-time decay of small solutions in L_2 — in [6].

Of course, the presence of any regularization can improve results on well-posedness and long-time decay of solutions.

In [7] the problem in the strip Σ with initial and boundary conditions (1.2), (1.3) is studied for an equation

$$u_t + u_{xxx} + u_{xyy} + uu_x - (a_1(x, y)u_x)_x - (a_2(x, y)u_y)_y + a_0(x.y)u = 0.$$

The functions a_1, a_2 are assumed to be non-negative, that is the parabolic damping can degenerate. Certain results on global existence and uniqueness of weak solutions in L_2 and H^1 spaces (possibly weighted at $+\infty$) as well as their long-time decay in L_2 (not only for small solutions) are established when the parabolic damping is effective either at both inifinities or only at $+\infty$ or only at $-\infty$ or even be absent. For example, for $u_0 \in L_2(\Sigma)$ and $a_j \in L_\infty(\Sigma)$ satisfying inequalities

$$a_2(x, y) \geq \beta_2(x) \geq 0, \quad a_0(x, y) \geq \beta_0(x) \quad \forall (x, y) \in \Sigma,$$
$$\frac{\pi^2 \beta_2(x)}{L^2} + \beta_0(x) \geq \beta = \mathrm{const} > 0 \qquad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}$$

(that is either dissipation or absorption must be effective at every point) there exists a global solution such that

$$\|u(t, \cdot, \cdot)\|_{L_2(\Sigma)} \leq e^{-\beta t} \|u_0\|_{L_2(\Sigma)} \qquad \forall t \geq 0.$$

If dissipation is effective at both infinities, that is $a_1, a_2 \geq a = \mathrm{const} > 0$ for $|x| \geq R$, the problem is globally well-posed and similar exponential decal in $L_2(\Sigma)$ is valid without any absorption ($a_0 \geq 0$).

In [11] the same initial-boundary value problem is studied for an equation

$$u_t + u_{xxx} + u_{xyy} + uu_x - u_{xx} = 0$$

and results on global well-posedness in certain class of weak and regular solutions (decaying exponentially as $x \to +\infty$) as well as their exponential long-time decay in L_2 (for weak solutions) and H^1 (for regular ones) norms are obtained.

Note that without any additional damping of Zakharov–Kuznetsov equation the long-time decay of solutions to the considered problem is impossible even in L_2 because of the conservation law

$$\iint_\Sigma u^2(t,x,y)\,dxdy = \text{const}.$$

In the present paper results on global well-posedness and long-time decay of solutions to problem (1.1)–(1.3) are established in the spaces $H^s(\Sigma)$ for $s \in [0,2]$.

Introduce the following notation. For an integer $k \geq 0$ let

$$|D^k\varphi| = \Big(\sum_{k_1+k_2=k} (\partial_x^{k_1}\partial_y^{k_2}\varphi)^2 \Big)^{1/2}, \qquad |D\varphi| = |D^1\varphi|.$$

Let $L_p = L_p(\Sigma)$ for $p \in [1,+\infty]$, $H^s = H^s(\Sigma)$, $H_0^s = H_0^s(\Sigma)$ for $s \in \mathbb{R}$.

For any $T_1 < T_2$ let $\Pi_{T_1,T_2} = (T_1,T_2)\times\Sigma$, let $\Pi_T = \Pi_{0,T}$, $\Pi = \Pi_{+\infty} = \mathbb{R}_+\times\Sigma$. For $s \geq 0$ define a functional space

$$X^s(\Pi_{T_1,T_2}) = C([T_1,T_2];H^s) \cap L_2(T_1,T_2;H^{s+1}\cap H_0^1).$$

We construct solutions to the considered problem lying in spaces $X^s(\Pi_T)$ for any $T>0$ if $s \in [0,2]$.

The main result of the paper is the following theorem.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $u_0 \in H^s$ for a certain $s \in [0,2]$ and, in addition, $u_0(x,0) = u_0(x,L) \equiv 0$ if $s > 1/2$ and $\big(y^{-1/2} + (L-y)^{-1/2}\big)u_0 \in L_2$ if $s = 1/2$. Then there exists a unique solution to problem (1.1)–(1.3) $u \in X^s(\Pi_T)$ for any $T>0$. Moreover, there exist a constant $\beta(s) > 0$ and a function $\sigma_s(\theta)$ nondecreasing with respect to $\theta \geq 0$ such that*

$$\|u(t,\cdot,\cdot)\|_{H^s} \leq \sigma_s(\|u_0\|_{H^{s_0}})e^{-\beta(s)t}\|u_0\|_{H^s} \qquad \forall\ t \geq 0, \tag{1.4}$$

where $s_0 = 0$ if $s \in [0,1]$, $s_0 = 1$ if $s \in (1,2]$.

Compare this result with the one-dimensional case from [4] (in fact, the present paper is inspired by that one), where the initial value problem is considered for damped Korteweg–de Vries–Burgers equation

$$u_t + u_{xxx} + uu_x - u_{xx} + a(x)u = 0.$$

The function $a \equiv a_0 + a_1$, where $a_0 = \text{const} > 0$, $a_1 \in H^1(\mathbb{R}) \cap L_p(\mathbb{R})$ for $p \in [1,+\infty)$ and $\|a_1\|_{L_p(\mathbb{R})}$ is small in some sense (depending on p and a_0). Then for the initial data from $H^s(\mathbb{R})$, $s \in [0,3]$, the considered problem is globally well-posed with exponential decay as $t \to +\infty$ of solutions also in the space $H^s(\mathbb{R})$. Note that the function a is allowed to change sign but, of course, the presence of certain absorption is provided by the constant a_0.

Moreover, for pure Korteweg–de Vries–Burgers equation ($a \equiv 0$) exponential decay of solutions to the initial value problem is in general case impossible even in $L_2(\mathbb{R})$, because it is proved in [1] that for $u_0 \in L_2(\mathbb{R}) \cap L_1(\mathbb{R})$ a corresponding solution to the initial value problem satisfies an inequality

$$\|u(t,\cdot)\|_{L_2(\mathbb{R})} \leq c(1+t)^{-1/4} \qquad \forall t \geq 0$$

and this result is sharp, so here dissipation without absorption ensures only power decay.

The idea that homogeneous Dirichlet boundary conditions in the horizontal strip of a finite width provide internal dissipation for Zakharov–Kuznetsov equation

which, in particular, yields exponential long-time decay of solutions was for the first time used in [9].

Note that it is shown in [3] that the exponential long-time decay of solutions in $L_2(\mathbb{R})$ holds for the initial value problem for damped Korteweg–de Vries equation

$$u_t + u_{xxx} + uu_x + a(x) = 0$$

even in the case of a localized absorption, that is if $a(x) \geq 0 \ \ \forall x \in \mathbb{R}\,,\ a(x) \geq a_0 = \mathrm{const} > 0$ for $|x| \geq R\,.$

Long-time behavior of solutions at $H^2(\mathbb{R})$ level for the initial value problem for generalized Korteweg–de Vries–Burgers equation with constant absorption with the use of the global attractors theory is studied in [5].

Further let $\eta(x)$ denotes a cut-off function, namely, η is an infinitely smooth non-decreasing on $\mathbb{R}$ function such that $\eta(x) = 0$ when $x \leq 0\,,\ \eta(x) = 1$ when $x \geq 1\,,\ \eta(x) + \eta(1-x) \equiv 1\,.$

We omit limits of integration in integrals over the whole strip $\Sigma\,.$

The following interpolating inequality from [8] is crucial for the study.

Lemma 1.2. *Let k be natural, $m \in [0,k)$ – integer, $q \in [2,+\infty]$ if $k-m \geq 2$ and $q \in [2,+\infty)$ in other cases. Then there exists a constant $c > 0$ such that for every function $\varphi(x,y) \in H^k$ the following inequality holds*

$$\big\||D^m\varphi|\big\|_{L_q} \leq c\big\||D^k\varphi|\big\|_{L_2}^{2s}\big\|\varphi\big\|_{L_2}^{1-2s} + c\big\|\varphi\big\|_{L_2}, \tag{1.5}$$

where $s = \dfrac{m+1}{2k} - \dfrac{1}{kq}\,.$

The use of nonlinear interpolation in this paper is based on the following result from [15].

Lemma 1.3 (Tartar)**.** *Let B_0^j and B_1^j be Banach spaces such, that $B_1^j \subset B_0^j$ with continuous inclusion mappings, $j = 1,2\,.$ Let $B_\theta^j = (B_0^j, B_1^j)_{\theta,2}\,,\ \theta \in (0,1)\,,$ be a space, constructed by the method of real interpolation. Assume, that an operator $\mathcal{A}$ maps B_0^1 into $B_0^2\,,\ B_1^1$ into $B_1^2\,,$ where for any $f, g \in B_0^1$*

$$\|\mathcal{A}f - \mathcal{A}g\|_{B_0^2} \leq c_1(\|f\|_{B_0^1}, \|g\|_{B_0^1})\|f-g\|_{B_0^1},$$

and for any $h \in B_1^1$

$$\|\mathcal{A}h\|_{B_1^2} \leq c_2(\|h\|_{B_0^1})\|h\|_{B_1^1}.$$

Then for any $\theta \in (0,1)$ the operator $\mathcal{A}$ maps B_θ^1 into B_θ^2 and for any $f \in B_\theta^1$

$$\|\mathcal{A}f\|_{B_\theta^2} \leq c(\|f\|_{B_0^1})\|f\|_{B_\theta^1},$$

where all the functions c_1, c_2, c are nondecreasing with respect to their arguments.

For the decay results we need Steklov inequality in such a form: for $\psi \in H_0^1(0,L)$

$$\int_0^L \psi^2(y)\,dy \leq \frac{L^2}{\pi^2}\int_0^L \big(\psi'(y)\big)^2\,dy. \tag{1.6}$$

The paper is organized as follows. Auxiliary linear problems are considered in Section 2. Section 3 is devoted to global well-posedness of the original problem. Decay of solutions is studied in Section 4.

2. An auxiliary linear problem

In an arbitrary layer Π_T consider a linear equation

$$u_t + u_{xxx} + u_{xyy} - \delta(u_{xx} + u_{yy}) = f(t,x,y) \tag{2.1}$$

and set initial and boundary conditions (1.2), (1.3).

Introduce certain additional function spaces. Let $\mathcal{S}(\overline{\Sigma})$ be a space of infinitely smooth in $\overline{\Sigma} = \mathbb{R}\times[0,L]$ functions $\varphi(x,y)$ such that $(1+|x|)^n|\partial_x^k\partial_y^l\varphi(x,y)| \le c(n,k,l)$ for any integer non-negative n,k,l and all $(x,y)\in\overline{\Sigma}$.

Lemma 2.1. *Let $u_0 \in \mathcal{S}(\overline{\Sigma})$, $f \in C^\infty\big([0,T];\mathcal{S}(\overline{\Sigma})\big)$ and for any integer $j\ge 0$*

$$\partial_y^{2j}u_0\big|_{y=0} = \partial_y^{2j}u_0\big|_{y=L} = 0, \qquad \partial_y^{2j}f\big|_{y=0} = \partial_y^{2j}f\big|_{y=L} = 0.$$

Then there exists a unique solution to problem (2.1), (1.2), (1.3) $u \in C^\infty\big([0,T];\mathcal{S}(\overline{\Sigma})\big)$.

Proof. For any natural l let $\psi_l(y) \equiv \sqrt{\frac{2}{L}}\sin\frac{\pi l}{L}y$, $\lambda_l = \big(\frac{\pi l}{L}\big)^2$. Then a solution to the considered problem can be written as follows:

$$u(t,x,y) = \frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{\mathbb{R}}\sum_{l=1}^{+\infty} e^{i\xi x}\psi_l(y)\widehat{u}(t,\xi,l)\,d\xi,$$

where

$$\widehat{u}(t,\xi,l) \equiv \widehat{u_0}(\xi,l)e^{\big(i(\xi^3+\xi\lambda_l)-\delta(\xi^2+\lambda_l)\big)t} + \int_0^t \widehat{f}(\tau,\xi,l)e^{\big(i(\xi^3+\xi\lambda_l)-\delta(\xi^2+\lambda_l)\big)(t-\tau)}\,d\tau,$$

$$\widehat{u_0}(\xi,l) \equiv \iint e^{-i\xi x}\psi_l(y)u_0(x,y)\,dxdy, \quad \widehat{f}(t,\xi,l) \equiv \iint e^{-i\xi x}\psi_l(y)f(t,x,y)\,dxdy,$$

and, obviously, $u \in C^\infty([0,T],\mathcal{S}(\overline{\Sigma}))$. □

Next, consider generalized solutions. Let $u_0 \in \mathcal{S}'(\overline{\Sigma})$, $f \in \big(C^\infty([0,T];\mathcal{S}(\overline{\Sigma}))\big)'$.

Definition 2.2. A function $u \in \big(C^\infty([0,T];\mathcal{S}(\overline{\Sigma}))\big)'$ is called a generalized solution to problem (2.1), (1.2), (1.3), if for any function $\phi \in C^\infty\big([0,T];\mathcal{S}(\overline{\Sigma})\big)$, such that $\phi|_{t=T} = 0$ and $\phi|_{y=0} = \phi|_{y=L} = 0$, the following equality holds:

$$\langle u, \phi_t + \phi_{xxx} + \phi_{xyy} + \delta\phi_{xx} + \delta\phi_{yy}\rangle + \langle f,\phi\rangle + \langle u_0, \phi|_{t=0}\rangle = 0. \tag{2.2}$$

Lemma 2.3. *A generalized solution to problem (2.1), (1.2), (1.3) is unique.*

Proof. The proof is implemented by standard Hölmgren's argument on the basis of Lemma 2.1. □

Lemma 2.4. *Let $u_0 \in L_2$, $f \equiv f_0 + f_{1x} + f_{2y}$, where $f_0 \in L_1(0,T;L_2)$, $f_1, f_2 \in L_2(\Pi_T)$. Then there exists a (unique) generalized solution to problem (2.1), (1.2), (1.3) $u \in X^0(\Pi_T)$. Moreover, for any $t \in (0,T]$*

$$\|u\|_{X^0(\Pi_t)} \le c(T,\delta)\left[\|u_0\|_{L_2} + \|f_0\|_{L_1(0,t;L_2)} + \|f_1\|_{L_2(\Pi_t)} + \|f_2\|_{L_2(\Pi_t)}\right] \tag{2.3}$$

and

$$\iint u^2(t,x,y)\,dxdy + 2\delta\int_0^t\iint (u_x^2+u_y^2)\,dxdyd\tau = \iint u_0^2\,dxdy + 2\int_0^t\iint (f_0u - f_1u_x - f_2u_y)\,dxdyd\tau. \quad (2.4)$$

Proof. It is sufficient to consider smooth solutions from Lemma 2.1 because of linearity of the problem.

Multiplying (2.1) by $2u(t,x,y)$ and integrating over Σ we obtain an equality

$$\frac{d}{dt}\iint u^2\,dxdy + 2\delta\iint (u_x^2+u_y^2)\,dxdy = 2\iint (f_0u - f_1u_x - f_2u_y)\,dxdy, \quad (2.5)$$

whence (2.3) and (2.4) are immediate. □

Lemma 2.5. *Let* $u_0 \in H_0^1$, $f \equiv f_0 + f_1$, *where* $f_0 \in L_1(0,T;H_0^1)$, $f_1 \in L_2(\Pi_T)$. *Then there exists a (unique) generalized solution to problem* (2.1), (1.2), (1.3) $u \in X^1(\Pi_T)$. *Moreover, for any* $t \in (0,T]$

$$\|u\|_{X^1(\Pi_t)} \le c(T,\delta)\left[\|u_0\|_{H^1} + \|f_0\|_{L_1(0,t_0;H^1)} + \|f_1\|_{L_2(\Pi_t)}\right] \quad (2.6)$$

and

$$\iint (u_x^2+u_y^2)\,dxdy + 2\delta\int_0^t\iint (u_{xx}^2+2u_{xy}^2+u_{yy}^2)\,dxdyd\tau = \iint (u_{0x}^2+u_{0y}^2)\,dxdy + 2\int_0^t\iint (f_{0x}u_x + f_{0y}u_y - f_1u_{xx} - f_1u_{yy})\,dxdyd\tau. \quad (2.7)$$

Proof. In the smooth case multiplying (2.1) by $-2\big(u_{xx}(t,x,y)+u_{yy}(t,x,y)\big)$ and integrating over Σ one obtains an equality

$$\frac{d}{dt}\iint (u_x^2+u_y^2)\,dxdy + 2\delta\iint (u_{xx}^2+2u_{xy}^2+u_{yy}^2)\,dxdy = 2\iint (f_{0\,x}u_x + f_{0\,y}u_y)\,dxdy - 2\iint f_1(u_{xx}+u_{yy})\,dxdy, \quad (2.8)$$

whence (2.6) and (2.7) follows. □

Lemma 2.6. *Let the hypothesis of Lemma 2.5 be satisfied. Then for the solution to problem* (2.1), (1.2), (1.3) $u \in X^1(\Pi_T)$ *for any* $t \in (0,T]$

$$-\frac{1}{3}\iint u^3(t,x,y)\,dxdy + 2\int_0^t\iint uu_x(u_{xx}+u_{yy})\,dxdyd\tau + \delta\int_0^t\iint u^2(u_{xx}+u_{yy})\,dxdyd\tau = -\frac{1}{3}\iint u_0^3\,dxdy - \int_0^t\iint fu^2\,dxdyd\tau. \quad (2.9)$$

Proof. In the smooth case multiplying (2.1) by $-u^2(t,x,y)$ and integrating one instantly obtains equality (2.9).

In the general case we obtain this equality via closure. Note that by virtue of (1.5) if $u \in X^1(\Pi_T)$ then

$$u \in C([0,T];L_p),\ u_x, u_y \in L_2(0,T;L_p) \quad \text{for any } p \in [2,+\infty) \quad (2.10)$$

and this passage to the limit is easily justified. □

Lemma 2.7. *Let* $u_0 \in H^2 \cap H^1_0$, $f \in L_1(0,T;H^2 \cap H^1_0)$. *Then there exists a (unique) generalized solution to problem* (2.1), (1.2), (1.3) $u \in X^2(\Pi_T)$. *Moreover, for any* $t \in (0,T]$

$$\|u\|_{X^2(\Pi_t)} \le c(T,\delta)\left[\|u_0\|_{H^2} + \|f\|_{L_1(0,t_0;H^2)}\right] \tag{2.11}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}&\iint (u_{xx}^2 + u_{xy}^2 + u_{yy}^2)\,dxdy + 2\delta\int_0^t\iint (u_{xxx}^2 + 2u_{xxy}^2 + 2u_{xyy}^2 + u_{yyy}^2)\,dxdyd\tau\\ &= \iint (u_{0xx}^2 + u_{0xy}^2 + u_{0yy}^2)\,dxdy + 2\int_0^t\iint (f_{xx}u_{xx} + f_{xy}u_{xy} + f_{yy}u_{yy})\,dxdyd\tau.\end{aligned} \tag{2.12}$$

Proof. In the smooth case multiplying (2.1) by $2\big(u_{xxxx}(t,x,y) + u_{xxyy}(t,x,y) + u_{yyyy}(t,x,y)\big)$ and integrating over Σ one obtains an equality

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d}{dt}\iint (u_{xx}^2 + u_{xy}^2 + u_{yy}^2)\,dxdy + 2\delta\iint (u_{xxx}^2 + 2u_{xxy}^2 + 2u_{xyy}^2 + u_{yyy}^2)\,dxdy\\ = 2\iint (f_{xx}u_{xx} + f_{xy}u_{xy} + f_{yy}u_{yy})\,dxdy,\end{aligned} \tag{2.13}$$

whence (2.11) and (2.12) follows. Note also that the functions u_0 and f can be approximated by corresponding functions satisfying the hypothesis of Lemma 2.1. □

3. Global well-posedness

Definition 3.1. Let $u_0 \in L_2$. A function $u \in L_\infty(0,T;L_2) \cap L_2(0,T;H^1)$ is called a weak solution to problem (1.1)–(1.3) in a layer Π_T for some $T > 0$ if for any function $\phi \in L_2(0,T;H^3 \cap H^1_0)$, such that $\phi_t \in L_2(\Pi_T)$ and $\phi|_{t=T} = 0$, the following equality holds:

$$\begin{aligned}\iiint_{\Pi_T} \big[u(\phi_t + \phi_{xxx} + \phi_{xyy}) + \frac{1}{2}u^2\phi_x - \delta u_x\phi_x - \delta u_y\phi_y\big]\,dxdyd\tau\\ + \iint_\Sigma u_0\phi\big|_{t=0}\,dxdy = 0.\end{aligned} \tag{3.1}$$

If u is a weak solution to this problem in Π_T for any $T > 0$ it is called a weak solution to problem (1.1)–(1.3) in the layer Π .

Remark 3.2. By virtue of (1.5) for any function $u \in L_\infty(0,T;L_2) \cap L_2(0,T;H^1)$

$$\begin{aligned}\|u^2\|_{L_2(\Pi_T)} &\le c\Big[\int_0^T \Big(\iint \big(|Du|^2 + u^2\big)\,dxdy \iint u^2\,dxdy\Big)\,dt\Big]^{1/2}\\ &\le \|u\|_{L_2(0,T;H^1)}\|u\|_{L_\infty(0,T;L_2)} < \infty,\end{aligned} \tag{3.2}$$

therefore $u^2\phi_x \in L_1(\Pi_T)$.

Theorem 3.3. *Let* $u_0 \in L_2$. *Then problem* (1.1)–(1.3) *has a unique weak solution* u *in* Π *such that* $u \in X^0(\Pi_T)$ *for any* $T > 0$. *The mapping* $u_0 \mapsto u$ *is*

Lipschitz continuous on any ball in the norm of the mapping from L_2 *into* $X^0(\Pi_T)$. *Moreover, the function* $\|u(t,\cdot,\cdot)\|^2_{L_2}$ *is absolutely continuous for* $t \ge 0$ *and*

$$\frac{d}{dt}\iint u^2(t,x,y)\,dxdy + 2\delta\iint \big(u_x^2(t,x,y) + u_y^2(t,x,y)\big)\,dxdy = 0 \quad \textit{for a.e. } t > 0. \tag{3.3}$$

Proof. Consider first an auxiliary initial-boundary value problem in Π with initial and boundary conditions (1.2), (1.3) for an equation

$$u_t + u_{xxx} + u_{xyy} - \delta(u_{xx} + u_{yy}) + (g_h(u))_x = 0, \tag{3.4}$$

where for $h \in (0,1]$

$$g_h(u) \equiv \int_0^u \Big[\theta\eta(2 - h|\theta|) + \frac{2\operatorname{sign}\theta}{h}\eta(h|\theta| - 1)\Big]\,d\theta. \tag{3.5}$$

Note that $g_h(u) = u^2/2$ if $|u| \le 1/h$, $|g_h'(u)| \le 2/h$ $\forall u \in \mathbb{R}$ and $|g_h'(u)| \le 2|u|$ uniformly with respect to h.

We use the contraction principle to prove well-posedness of this problem in the space $X^0(\Pi_T)$ for any $T > 0$.

Fix $T > 0$. For $t_0 \in (0,T]$ define a mapping Λ on a set $X^0(\Pi_{t_0})$ as follows: $u = \Lambda v \in X^0(\Pi_{t_0})$ is a generalized solution to a linear problem

$$u_t + u_{xxx} + u_{xyy} - \delta(u_{xx} + u_{yy}) = -(g_h(v))_x \tag{3.6}$$

in Π_{t_0} with initial and boundary conditions (1.2), (1.3).

Note that $|g_h(v)| \le 2|v|/h$ and, therefore, $g_h(u) \in L_2(\Pi_{t_0})$. According to Lemma 2.4 the mapping Λ exists. Moreover, for functions $v, \widetilde{v} \in X^0(\Pi_{t_0})$

$$\|g_h(v) - g_h(\widetilde{v})\|_{L_2(\Pi_{t_0})} \le \frac{2}{h}\|v - \widetilde{v}\|_{L_2(\Pi_{t_0})} \le \frac{2t_0^{1/2}}{h}\|v - \widetilde{v}\|_{C([0,t_0];L_2)}.$$

Inequality (2.3) yields that

$$\|\Lambda v - \Lambda\widetilde{v}\|_{X^0(\Pi_{t_0})} \le \frac{c(T,\delta)}{h}t_0^{1/2}\|v - \widetilde{v}\|_{X^0(\Pi_{t_0})},$$

that is for small t_0, depending only on T, δ and h, the mapping Λ is the contraction in $X^0(\Pi_{t_0})$. Since t_0 is uniform with respect to $\|u_0\|_{L_2}$ by the standard argument we construct a solution to problem (3.4), (1.2), (1.3) $u_h \in X^0(\Pi_T)$.

Now establish appropriate estimates for functions u_h uniform with respect to h. Equality (2.4) (where $f_0 = f_2 \equiv 0$, $f_1 \equiv -g_h(u)$) provides that

$$\iint u_h^2(t,x,y)\,dxdy + 2\delta\int_0^t\iint (u_{hx}^2 + u_{hy}^2)\,dxdyd\tau = \iint u_0^2\,dxdy + 2\int_0^t\iint g_h(u_h)u_{hx}\,dxdyd\tau. \tag{3.7}$$

Since the last integral is obviously equal to zero it follows from (3.7) that uniformly with respect to h

$$\|u_h\|_{X^0(\Pi_T)} \le c. \tag{3.8}$$

Therefore, uniformly with respect to h

$$\|g_h(u_h)\|_{L_2(\Pi_T)} \le \|u_h^2\|_{L_2(\Pi_T)} \le c. \tag{3.9}$$

From estimates (3.8), (3.9) and equation (3.4) itself follows that uniformly with respect to h

$$\|u_{ht}\|_{L_2(0,T;H^{-2})} \le c. \tag{3.10}$$

Inequalities (3.2), (3.8)–(3.10) by the standard argument provide existence of a weak solution u to problem (1.1)–(1.3) in $L_\infty(0,T;L_2)\cap L_2(0,T;H_0^1)$.

Next, Lemma 2.3 (where $f_0 = f_2 \equiv 0$, $f_1 \equiv -u^2/2 \in L_2(\Pi_T)$) provides that (after possible change on a set of the zero measure) $u \in C([0,T];L_2)$ and similarly to (3.7)

$$\iint u^2(t,x,y)\,dxdy + 2\delta\int_0^t\iint |Du|^2\,dxdyd\tau = \iint u_0^2\,dxdy. \tag{3.11}$$

In particular, equality (3.11) yields that the function $\|u(t,\cdot,\cdot)\|_{L_2}^2$ is absolutely continuous and equality (3.3) is satisfied.

Finally, establish properties of uniqueness and continuous dependence. Let u and $\widetilde{u}$ be two solutions in the considered space corresponding to initial data u_0 and $\widetilde{u}_0$, $v \equiv u - \widetilde{u}$, $v_0 \equiv u_0 - \widetilde{u}_0$. Then the function v is a weak solution to a linear problem

$$v_t + v_{xxx} + v_{xyy} - \delta(v_{xx} + v_{yy}) = \frac{1}{2}(\widetilde{u}^2 - u^2)_x, \tag{3.12}$$

$$v\big|_{t=0} = v_0, \qquad v\big|_{y=0} = v\big|_{y=L} = 0. \tag{3.13}$$

Obviously the hypothesis of Lemma 2.3 are satisfied for this problem and equality (2.4) provides that

$$\iint v^2(t,x,y)\,dxdy + 2\delta\int_0^t\iint |Dv|^2\,dxdyd\tau = \iint v_0^2\,dxdy + \int_0^t\iint (u+\widetilde{u})vv_x\,dxdyd\tau.$$

Here

$$\begin{aligned}\iint |uvv_x|\,dxdy &\le \Big(\iint u^4\,dxdy\Big)^{1/4}\Big(\iint v^4\,dxdy\Big)^{1/4}\Big(\iint v_x^2\,dxdy\Big)^{1/2}\\ &\le c\Big(\iint (|Du|^2+u^2)\,dxdy\Big)^{1/4}\Big(\iint u^2\,dxdx\Big)^{1/4}\\ &\quad\times\Big(\iint (|Dv|^2+v^2)\,dxdy\Big)^{3/4}\Big(\iint v^2\,dxdy\Big)^{1/4}\\ &\le \varepsilon\iint |Dv|^2\,dxdy + c(\varepsilon)\iint (|Du|^2+u^2)\,dxdy\iint v^2\,dxdy,\end{aligned}$$

where $\varepsilon > 0$ can be chosen arbitrarily small. With use of (3.11) we finish the proof of the theorem. □

Theorem 3.4. *Let $u_0 \in H_0^1$. Then problem (1.1)–(1.3) has a unique weak solution u in Π such that $u \in X^1(\Pi_T)$ for any $T > 0$. The mapping $u_0 \mapsto u$ in Lipschitz continuous on any ball in the norm of the mapping from H^1 into $X^1(\Pi_T)$ and*

$$\|u\|_{X^1(\Pi_T)} \le \varkappa_1(T, \|u_0\|_{L_2})\|u_0\|_{H^1}, \tag{3.14}$$

where the positive function $\varkappa_1$ is nondecreasing with respect to its arguments. Moreover, the function $\big\||Du|(t,\cdot,\cdot)\big\|_{L_2}^2$ is absolutely continuous for $t\ge 0$ and

$$\frac{d}{dt}\iint (u_x^2+u_y^2)\,dxdy+2\delta\iint (u_{xx}^2+2u_{xy}^2+u_{yy}^2)\,dxdy \\ =2\iint uu_x(u_{xx}+u_{yy})\,dxdy \quad \text{for a.e. } t>0. \tag{3.15}$$

Proof. As in the proof of Theorem 3.3 we first apply the contraction principle but for the original problem. To this end consider an initial-boundary value problem for a linear equation

$$u_t+u_{xxx}+u_{xyy}-\delta(u_{xx}+u_{yy})=-vv_x \tag{3.16}$$

with initial and boundary conditions (1.2), (1.3). Again fix $T>0$. For $t_0\in(0,T]$ let $v\in X^1(\Pi_{t_0})$ and $u=\Lambda v$ be a solution to this problem from the space $X^1(\Pi_{t_0})$ also. Note that by virtue of (1.5)

$$\|vv_x\|_{L_2(\Pi_{t_0})}\le\Big[\int_0^{t_0}\Big(\sup_{(x,y)\in\Sigma}v^2\iint v_x^2\,dxdy\Big)\,dt\Big]^{1/2} \\ \le c\Big[\int_0^{t_0}\Big(\iint\big(|D^2v|^2+v^2\big)\,dxdy\iint v^2\,dxdy\Big)^{1/2}dt\Big]^{1/2}\sup_{t\in(0,t_0)}\Big(\iint v_x^2\,dxdy\Big)^{1/2} \\ \le ct_0^{1/4}\|v\|^{1/2}_{L_2(0,t_0;H^2)}\|v\|^{3/2}_{C([0,t_0];H^1)}\le ct_0^{1/4}\|v\|^2_{X^1(\Pi_{t_0})} \tag{3.17}$$

and similarly

$$\|vv_x-\widetilde{v}\widetilde{v}_x\|_{L_2(\Pi_{t_0})}\le ct_0^{1/4}\big(\|v\|_{X^1(\Pi_{t_0})}+\|\widetilde{v}\|_{X^1(\Pi_{t_0})}\big)\|v-\widetilde{v}\|_{X^1(\Pi_{t_0})}. \tag{3.18}$$

In particular, the hypothesis of Lemma 2.5 is satisfied (for $f_0\equiv 0$, $f_1\equiv -vv_x$) and, therefore, the mapping Λ exists. Moreover, inequalities (2.6), (3.17), (3.18) provide that

$$\|\Lambda v\|_{X^1(\Pi_{t_0})}\le c(T,\delta)\big[\|u_0\|_{H^1}+t_0^{1/4}\|v\|^2_{X^1(\Pi_{t_0})}\big], \tag{3.19}$$

$$\|\Lambda v-\lambda\widetilde{v}\|_{X^1(\Pi_{t_0})}\le c(T,\delta)\big[\|u_0-\widetilde{u}_0\|_{H^1} \\ +t_0^{1/4}\big(\|v\|_{X^1(\Pi_{t_0})}+\|\widetilde{v}\|_{X^1(\Pi_{t_0})}\big)\|v-\widetilde{v}\|_{X^1(\Pi_{t_0})}\big]. \tag{3.20}$$

Local well-posedness of problem (1.1)–(1.3) on the time interval $(0,t_0)$ depending on $\|u_0\|_{H^1}$ follows from (3.19), (3.20) by the standard argument.

In order to extend this local solution to an arbitrary time interval establish the corresponding a priori estimate. Let $u\in X^1(\Pi_{T'})$ be a solution to problem (1.1)–(1.3). Again apply Lemma 2.5, where $f_0\equiv 0$, $f_1\equiv -uu_x$. It follows from equality (2.7) that

$$\iint (u_x^2+u_y^2)\,dxdy+2\delta\int_0^t\iint (u_{xx}^2+2u_{xy}^2+u_{yy}^2)\,dxdyd\tau=\iint (u_{0\,x}^2+u_{0\,y}^2)\,dxdy \\ +2\int_0^t\iint uu_x(u_{xx}+u_{yy})\,dxdyd\tau. \tag{3.21}$$

Next, apply Lemma 2.6, then equality (2.9) yields that

$$-\frac{1}{3}\iint u^3(t,x,y)\,dxdy + 2\int_0^t\iint uu_x(u_{xx}+u_{yy})\,dxdyd\tau$$
$$+\delta\int_0^t\iint u^2(u_{xx}+u_{yy})\,dxdyd\tau = -\frac{1}{3}\iint u_0^3\,dxdy + \int_0^t\iint u^3u_x\,dxdyd\tau. \quad (3.22)$$

Summing (3.21) and (3.22) provides an equality

$$\iint\Big(u_x^2+u_y^2-\frac{1}{3}u^3\Big)\,dxdy + 2\delta\int_0^t\iint(u_{xx}^2+2u_{xy}^2+u_{yy}^2)\,dxdyd\tau$$
$$+\delta\int_0^t\iint u^2(u_{xx}+u_{yy})\,dxdyd\tau = \iint\Big(u_{0\,x}^2+u_{0\,y}^2-\frac{1}{3}u_0^3\Big)\,dxdy. \quad (3.23)$$

By virtue of (1.5) and (3.11)

$$\iint|u|^3\,dxdy \le c\Big(\iint(|Du|^2+u^2)\,dxdy\Big)^{1/2}\iint u^2\,dxdy$$
$$\le\varepsilon\iint|Du|^2\,dxdy + c(\varepsilon)\left(\|u_0\|_{L_2}^2+\|u_0\|_{L_2}^4\right), \quad (3.24)$$

$$\Big|\iint u^2(u_{xx}+u_{yy})\,dxdy\Big| \le c\Big(\iint|D^2u|^2\,dxdx\Big)^{1/2}\Big(\iint u^4\,dxdy\Big)^{1/2}$$
$$\le c_1\Big(\iint(|D^2u|^2+u^2)\,dxdx\Big)^{3/4}\Big(\iint u^2\,dxdx\Big)^{3/4}$$
$$\le\varepsilon\iint|D^2u|^2\,dxdy + c(\varepsilon)\left(\|u_0\|_{L_2}^3+\|u_0\|_{L_2}^6\right), \quad (3.25)$$

where $\varepsilon>0$ can be chosen arbitrarily small. Combining (3.23)–(3.25) yields an inequality

$$\sup_{t\in(0,T')}\iint|Du|^2\,dxdy + \int_0^{T'}\iint|D^2u|^2\,dxdydt \le c(T')\left(1+\|u_0\|_{L_2}^4\right)\|u_0\|_{H^1}^2. \quad (3.26)$$

This estimate provides the desired global well-posedness and, moreover, estimate (3.14).

Finally, note that for the solution $u\in X^1(\Pi_T)$ similarly to (2.10) $uu_x\in L_2(\Pi_T)$ and, therefore, $\iint uu_x(u_{xx}+u_{yy})\,dxdy\in L_1(0,T)$. As a result, it follows from (3.21) that $\big\||Du|(t,\cdot,\cdot)\big\|_{L_2}^2$ is absolutely continuous and equality (3.15) holds. □

Corollary 3.5. *Let $u_0\in H^s$ for certain $s\in(0,1)$ and, in addition, $u_0\big|_{y=0} = u_0\big|_{y=L} = 0$ if $s>1/2$ and $(y^{-1/2}+(L-y)^{-1/2})u_0\in L_2$ if $s=1/2$. Then problem (1.1)–(1.3) has a unique weak solution u in Π such that $u\in X^s(\Pi_T)$ for any $T>0$. Moreover,*

$$\|u\|_{X^s(\Pi_T)} \le \varkappa_s(T,\|u_0\|_{L_2})\|u_0\|_{H^s}, \quad (3.27)$$

where the positive function $\varkappa_s$ is nondecreasing with respect to its arguments.

Proof. Results from [13] ensure that under the hypothesis of the corollary the function u_0 belong to spaces which form the real interpolation scale $(\cdot,\cdot)_{\theta,2}$. The spaces

$X^s(\Pi_T)$ also form the same interpolation scale. Then the corollary succeeds from Lemma 1.3 and Theorems 3.3 and 3.4. $\square$

Theorem 3.6. *Let $u_0 \in H^2 \cap H_0^1$. Then problem (1.1)–(1.3) has a unique weak solution u in Π such that $u \in X^2(\Pi_T)$ for any $T > 0$. The mapping $u_0 \mapsto u$ is Lipschitz continuous on any ball in the norm of the mapping from H^2 into $X^2(\Pi_T)$ and*

$$\|u\|_{X^2(\Pi_T)} \le \varkappa_2(T, \|u_0\|_{H^1})\|u_0\|_{H^2}, \tag{3.28}$$

where the positive function $\varkappa_2$ is nondecreasing with respect to its arguments. Moreover, the function $\big\||D^2u|(t,\cdot,\cdot)\big\|_{L_2}^2$ is absolutely continuous for $t \ge 0$ and

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{d}{dt}\iint (u_{xx}^2 + u_{xy}^2 + u_y^2)\,dxdy + 2\delta \iint (u_{xxx}^2 + 2u_{xxy}^2 + 2u_{xyy}^2 + u_{yyy}^2)\,dxdy\\ &= -2\iint \big((uu_x)_{xx}u_{xx} + (uu_x)_{xy}u_{xy} + (uu_x)_{yy}u_{yy}\big)\,dxdy \quad \text{for a.e. } t > 0.\end{aligned} \tag{3.29}$$

Proof. As in the proof of Theorem 3.4 consider linear initial-boundary value problem (3.16), (1.2), (1.3). For $T > 0$ and $t_0 \in (0, T]$ let $v \in X^2(\Pi_{t_0})$ and $u = \Lambda v$ be a solution to this problem from the space $X^2(\Pi_{t_0})$. In order to apply Lemma 2.7 we have to estimate $f = -vv_x$ in $L_1(0, t_0; H^2)$. For example, by virtue of (1.5)

$$\begin{aligned}\|vv_{xxx}\|_{L_1(0,t_0;L_2)} &\le \int_0^{t_0} \sup_{(x,y)\in\Sigma} |v| \Big(\iint v_{xxx}^2\,dxdy\Big)^{1/2} dt\\ &\le c\int_0^{t_0} \Big(\iint \big(|D^2v|^2 + v^2\big)\,dxdy\Big)^{1/2} \Big(\iint v_{xxx}^2\,dxdy\Big)^{1/2} dt\\ &\le ct_0^{1/2}\|v\|_{C([0,t_0];H^2)}\|v\|_{L_2(0,t_0;H^3)} \le ct_0^{1/2}\|v\|_{X^2(\Pi_{t_0})}^2,\end{aligned} \tag{3.30}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\|v_xv_{xx}\|_{L_1(0,t_0;L_2)} &\le \int_0^{t_0} \sup_{(x,y)\in\Sigma} |v_x| \Big(\iint v_{xx}^2\,dxdy\Big)^{1/2} dt\\ &\le c\int_0^{t_0} \Big(\iint \big(|D^3v|^2 + v_x^2\big)\,dxdy\Big)^{1/2} \Big(\iint v_{xx}^2\,dxdy\Big)^{1/2} dt\\ &\le ct_0^{1/2}\|v\|_{L_2(0,t_0;H^3)}\|v\|_{C([0,t_0];H^2)} \le ct_0^{1/2}\|v\|_{X^2(\Pi_{t_0})}^2.\end{aligned} \tag{3.31}$$

Other terms can be estimated in a similar way and, therefore, the hypothesis of Lemma 2.7 is satisfied and the mapping Λ exists. Moreover, inequalities (2.11), (3.30), (3.31) provide that

$$\|\Lambda v\|_{X^2(\Pi_{t_0})} \le c(T,\delta)\big[\|u_0\|_{H^2} + t_0^{1/2}\|v\|_{X^2(\Pi_{t_0})}^2\big]. \tag{3.32}$$

Moreover, one can similarly show that

$$\begin{aligned}\|\Lambda v - \lambda\widetilde{v}\|_{X^2(\Pi_{t_0})} \le c(T,\delta)\big[&\|u_0 - \widetilde{u}_0\|_{H^2}\\ &+ t_0^{1/2}\big(\|v\|_{X^2(\Pi_{t_0})} + \|\widetilde{v}\|_{X^2(\Pi_{t_0})}\big)\|v - \widetilde{v}\|_{X^2(\Pi_{t_0})}\big].\end{aligned} \tag{3.33}$$

Local well-posedness of problem (1.1)–(1.3) on the time interval $(0, t_0)$ depending on $\|u_0\|_{H^2}$ follows from (3.32), (3.33) by the standard argument.

In order to extend this local solution to an arbitrary time interval establish the corresponding a priori estimate. Let $u \in X^2(\Pi_{T'})$ be a solution to problem (1.1)–(1.3). Again apply Lemma 2.7, where $f \equiv -uu_x$. It follows from equality (2.12)

that

$$\iint (u_{xx}^2 + u_{xy}^2 + u_y^2)\,dxdy + 2\delta \int_0^{t_0} \iint (u_{xxx}^2 + 2u_{xxy}^2 + 2u_{xyy}^2 + u_{yyy}^2)\,dxdyd\tau$$
$$= \iint (u_{0\,xx}^2 + u_{0\,xy}^2 + u_{0\,yy}^2)\,dxdy$$
$$- 2\int_0^{t_0} \iint \big((uu_x)_{xx}u_{xx} + (uu_x)_{xy}u_{xy} + (uu_x)_{yy}u_{yy}\big)\,dxdyd\tau. \quad (3.34)$$

Here by virtue of (1.5) and (3.14)

$$\iint |uu_{xx}u_{xxx}|\,dxdy \le \Big(\iint u^4\,dxdy \iint u_{xx}^4\,dxdy\Big)^{1/4}\Big(\iint u_{xxx}^2\,dxdy\Big)^{1/2}$$
$$\le c_1\Big(\iint (|Du|^2+u^2)\,dxdy\Big)^{1/2}\Big(\iint u_{xx}^2\,dxdy\Big)^{1/4}\Big(\iint \big(|D^3u|^2+|D^2u|^2\big)\,dxdy\Big)^{3/4}$$
$$\le \varepsilon \iint |D^3u|^2\,dxdy + c(\varepsilon)\Big(\iint (|Du|^2+u^2)\,dxdy\Big)^2 \iint |D^2u|^2\,dxdy$$
$$\le \varepsilon \iint |D^3u|^2\,dxdy + c(\varepsilon, \|u_0\|_{H^1}) \iint |D^2u|^2\,dxdy, \quad (3.35)$$

$$\iint |u_x| u_{xx}^2\,dxdy \le \Big(\iint u_x^2\,dxdy\Big)^{1/2}\Big(\iint u_{xx}^4\,dxdy\Big)^{1/2}$$
$$\le c\Big(\iint u_x^2\,dxdy\Big)^{1/2}\Big(\iint u_{xx}^2\,dxdy\Big)^{1/2}\Big(\iint \big(|D^3u|^2+|D^2u|^2\big)\,dxdy\Big)^{1/2}$$
$$\le \varepsilon \iint |D^3u|^2\,dxdy + c(\varepsilon) \iint u_x^2\,dxdy \iint |D^2u|^2\,dxdy$$
$$\le \varepsilon \iint |D^3u|^2\,dxdy + c(\varepsilon, \|u_0\|_{H^1}) \iint |D^2u|^2\,dxdy, \quad (3.36)$$

where $\varepsilon > 0$ can be chosen arbitrarily small. Other terms in the right side of (3.34) are estimated in a similar way. Combining (3.34)–(3.36) yields an inequality

$$\sup_{t\in(0,T')} \iint |D^2u|^2\,dxdy + \int_0^{T'} \iint |D^3u|^2\,dxdydt \le c(T', \|u_0\|_{H^1})\|u_0\|_{H^2}^2. \quad (3.37)$$

This estimate provides the desired global well-posedness and, moreover, estimate (3.28).

Finally, note that for the solution $u \in X^2(\Pi_T)$ estimates (3.35), (3.36) ensure that $\iint \big((uu_x)_{xx}u_{xx} + (uu_x)_{xy}u_{xy} + (uu_x)_{yy}u_{yy}\big)\,dxdy \in L_1(0,T)$. Therefore, it follows from (3.34) that $\big\||D^2u|(t,\cdot,\cdot)\big\|_{L_2}^2$ is absolutely continuous and equality (3.29) holds. □

Corollary 3.7. *Let $u_0 \in H^s \cap H_0^1$ for a certain $s \in (1,2)$. Then problem (1.1)–(1.3) has a unique weak solution u in Π such that $u \in X^s(\Pi_T)$ for any $T > 0$. Moreover,*

$$\|u\|_{X^s(\Pi_T)} \le \varkappa_s(T, \|u_0\|_{H^1})\|u_0\|_{H^s}, \quad (3.38)$$

where the positive function $\varkappa_s$ is nondecreasing with respect to its arguments.

Proof. The hypothesis of the corollary provides that the consideed spaces for u_0 form the real interpolation scale $(\cdot,\cdot)_{\theta,2}$. The spaces $X^s(\Pi_T)$ also form the same interpolation scale. Then the corollary succeeds from Lemma 1.3 and Theorems 3.4 and 3.6. □

Corollary 3.8. *Let the hypothesis of Theorem 3.3 be satisfied. Consider the unique weak solution to problem* (1.1)–(1.3) u *in* Π *such that* $u \in X^0(\Pi_T)$ *for any* $T > 0$. *Then for any* $T > 0$ *and* $t_0 \in (0,T)$ *the function* $u \in X^2(\Pi_{t_0,T})$.

Proof. Since $u \in L_2(0,T;H^1)$ for any $t_0 \in (0,T)$ there exists $t_1 \in (0,t_0)$ such that $u(t_1,\cdot,\cdot) \in H_0^1$. Consider the function u as a weak solution to an initial-boundary value problem in $\Pi_{t_1,T}$ for equation (1.1) with initial data $u_0 = u(t_1,\cdot,\cdot)$ and boundary condition (1.3). The hypothesis of Theorem 3.4 are satisfied for this problem, therefore, $u \in X^1(\Pi_{t_1,T})$.

Similarly there exists $t_2 \in (t_1,t_0)$ such that $u(t_2,\cdot,\cdot) \in H^2 \cap H_0^1$. Now consider u as a weak solution to a similar initial-boundary value problem but in $\Pi_{t_2,T}$, then according to Theorem 3.6 $u \in X^2(\Pi_{t_2,T})$. □

4. Long-time decay

Lemma 4.1. *Let* $u_0 \in L_2$. *Then a weak solution to problem* (1.3)–(1.3) *from the space* $X^0(\Pi_T)$ *for any* $T > 0$ *satisfies inequality*

$$\|u(t,\cdot,\cdot)\|_{L_2} \le e^{-\delta\pi^2 L^{-2} t}\|u_0\|_{L_2} \qquad \forall\ t \ge 0. \tag{4.1}$$

Proof. Consider equality (3.3). With the use of inequality (1.6) we derive that

$$\iint u_y^2\,dxdy \ge \frac{\pi^2}{L^2}\iint u^2\,dxdy \tag{4.2}$$

and it follows (3.3) that

$$\frac{d}{dt}\iint u^2\,dxdy + \frac{2\delta\pi^2}{L^2}\iint u^2\,dxdy \le 0, \tag{4.3}$$

which yields (4.1). □

Lemma 4.2. *Let* $u_0 \in H_0^1$. *Then a weak solution to problem* (1.3)–(1.3) *from the space* $X^1(\Pi_T)$ *for any* $T > 0$ *satisfies inequality* (1.4) *for* $s = 1$.

Proof. Consider equality (3.15). By virtue of (1.5)

$$\Big|\iint uu_x(u_{xx}+u_{yy})\,dxdy\Big| \le c\sup_{(x,y)\in\Sigma}|u|\Big(\iint u_x^2\,dxdy\Big)^{1/2}\Big(\iint |D^2u|^2\,dxdy\Big)^{1/2}$$
$$\le c_1\iint\big(|D^2u|^2+u^2\big)\,dxdy\iint u^2\,dxdy. \tag{4.4}$$

Choose $T_1 = T_1(\|u_0\|_{L_2}) > 0$ such that according to (4.1)

$$\iint u^2(t,x,y)\,dxdy \le \min\big(\frac{\delta}{2c_1},\frac{\delta\pi^2}{2c_1L^2}\big) \qquad \forall\ t \ge T_1, \tag{4.5}$$

where c_1 is the constant from (4.4). Then summing (3.15), (3.3) and applying (1.6) yields

$$\frac{d}{dt}\iint\big(|Du|^2+u^2\big)\,dxdy+\delta\iint|Du|^2\,dxdy+\frac{\delta\pi^2}{2L^2}\iint u^2\,dxdy \le 0 \quad \forall t \ge T_1. \tag{4.6}$$

Since according to (3.14)

$$\|u(T_1,\cdot,\cdot)\|_{H^1} \le c(T_1,\|u_0\|_{L_2})\|u_0\|_{H^1} \tag{4.7}$$

inequality (4.6) provides the desired result. □

Lemma 4.3. *Let $u_0 \in H^2 \cap H^1_0$. Then a weak solution to problem (1.3)–(1.3) from the space $X^2(\Pi_T)$ for any $T>0$ satisfies inequality (1.4) for $s=2$.*

Proof. Consider equality (3.29). Similarly to (3.35), (3.36)

$$\iint |uu_{xx}u_{xxx}|\,dxdy + \iint |u_x|u_{xx}^2\,dxdy \\ \le \varepsilon \iint |D^3u|^2\,dxdy + c(\varepsilon)\iint (|Du|^2+u^2)\,dxdy \iint |D^2u|^2\,dxdy,$$

where $\varepsilon>0$ can be chosen arbitrarily small. Other terms in the right side of (3.29) are estimated in the same way. Therefore, it follows from this equality that

$$\frac{d}{dt}\iint |D^2u|^2\,dxdy \le c_2 \iint (|Du|^2+u^2)\,dxdy \iint |D^2u|^2\,dxdy. \tag{4.8}$$

Summing this inequality with (3.3), (3.15) and applying (1.6), (4.4) yields that

$$\frac{d}{dt}\iint \big(|D^2u|^2+|Du|^2+u^2\big)\,dxdy+\delta\iint \big(2|D^2u|^2+|Du|^2\big)\,dxdy+\frac{\delta\pi^2}{L^2}\iint u^2\,dxdy \\ \le c_1 \iint \big(|D^2u|^2+u^2\big)\,dxdy \iint u^2\,dxdy \\ + c_2 \iint (|Du|^2+u^2)\,dxdy \iint |D^2u|^2\,dxdy. \tag{4.9}$$

Choose $T_2 = T_2(\|u_0\|_{H^1})$ such that according to (1.4) for $s=1$

$$\iint \big(|Du|^2+u^2\big)\,dxdy \le \min\big(\frac{\delta}{2c_1},\frac{\delta\pi^2}{2c_1L^2},\frac{\delta}{2c_2}\big) \qquad \forall\ t\ge T_2,$$

then it follows from (4.9) that

$$\frac{d}{dt}\iint \big(|D^2u|^2+|Du|^2+u^2\big)\,dxdy \\ + \delta\iint \big(|D^2u|^2+|Du|^2\big)\,dxdy + \frac{\delta\pi^2}{2L^2}\iint u^2\,dxdy \le 0 \quad \forall t\ge T_2. \tag{4.10}$$

Since according to (3.28)

$$\|u(T_2,\cdot,\cdot)\|_{H^2} \le c(T_2,\|u_0\|_{H^1})\|u_0\|_{H^2} \tag{4.11}$$

inequality (4.10) provides the desired result. □

Now we can finish the proof of Theorem 1.1.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. It still remains to prove exponential decay of solutions for $s\in(0,1)$ and $s\in(1,2)$.

Let $s\in(0,1)$. By virtue of Corollary 3.5 it is sufficient to prove (1.4) for $t\ge 1$. Then Corollary 3.8 yields that $u\in X^1(\Pi_{1,T})$ for any $T>1$. We have with use of

(1.4) for $s=0$, $s=1$ and (3.14) that

$$\begin{aligned}\|u(t,\cdot,\cdot)\|_{H^s} &\le c(s)\|u\|_{L_2}^{1-s}\|u\|_{H^1}^{s}\\ &\le c_1 e^{-\beta(0)(1-s)t}\|u_0\|_{L_2}^{1-s} e^{-\beta(1)s(t-1)}\|u(1,\cdot,\cdot)\|_{H^1}^{s}\\ &\le c_1 e^{\beta(1)s} e^{-(\beta(0)(1-s)+\beta(1)s)t}\varkappa_1^s(1,\|u_0\|_{L_2})\|u_0\|_{L_2}, \quad (4.12)\end{aligned}$$

whence (1.4) follows. The case $s\in(1,2)$ is considered in a similar way with use of (1.4) for $s=1$, $s=2$ and (3.28). □

References

1. C.J. Amick, J.L. Bona and M.E. Schonbek, *Decay of solutions of some nonlinear wave equations*, J. Differential Equ., **81** (1989), 1–49.
2. E.S. Baykova and A.V. Faminskii, *On initial-boundary-value problems in a strip for the generalized two-dimensional Zakharov–Kuznetsov equation*, Adv. Differential Equ., **18** (2013), 663–686.
3. M.M. Cavalcanti, V.N. Domingos Cavalcanti, A. Faminskii and F. Natali, *Decay of solutions to damped Korteweg–de Vries type equation*, Appl. Math. Optim., **65** (2012), 221–251.
4. M.M. Cavalcanti, V.N. Domingos Cavalcanti, V. Komornik and J.H. Rodrigues, *Global well-posedness and exponential decay rates for a KdV–Burgers equation with indefinite damping*, Ann. I. H. Poincaré – AN (2013). http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.anihpc.2013.08.003.
5. T. Dlotko, *The generalized Korteweg–de Vries–Burgers equation in* $H^2(\mathbb{R})$, Nonlinear. Anal., **74** (2011), 721–732.
6. G.G. Doronin and N.A. Larkin, *Stabilization of regular solutions for the Zakharov–Kuznetsov equation posed on bounded rectangles and on a strip*, 25 Sep. 2012, arXiv: 1209.5767v1 [math.AP].
7. A.V. Faminskii, *An initial-boundary value problem in a strip for a two-dimensional equation of Zakharov–Kuznetsov type*. 15 Mar. 2014, arXiv:1312444v3 [math.AP].
8. O.A. Ladyzhenskaya, V.A. Solonnikov and N.N. Uraltseva, *Linear and Quasilinear Equations of Parabolic Type*, American Mathematical Society, Providence, Rhode Island, 1968.
9. N.A. Larkin and E. Tronco, *Regular solutions of the 2D Zakharov–Kuznetsov equation on a half-strip*, J. Differential Equ., **254** (2013), 81–101.
10. N.A. Larkin, *Exponential decay of the* H^1 *-norm for the* $2D$ *Zakharov–Kuznetsov equation on a half-strip*, J. Math. Anal. Appl., **405** (2013), 326–335.
11. N.A. Larkin, *The 2D Zakharov–Kuznetsov–Burgers equation on a strip*, 17 Apr. 2014, arXiv: 1404.4638v1 [math.AP].
12. F. Linares, A. Pastor and J.-C. Saut, *Well-posedness for the Zakharov–Kuznetsov equation in a cylinder and on the background of a KdV soliton*, Comm. Partial Differential Equ., **35** (2010), 1674–1689.
13. J.-L. Lions and E. Magenes, *Problemèmes aux limites non homogènes et applications*, 1968, Dunod-Paris.
14. J-C. Saut, R. Temam and C. Wang, *An initial and boundary-value problem for the Zakharov–Kuznetsov equation in a bounded domain*, J. Math. Phys., **53** (2012), 115612, doi: 10.1063/1.4752102.
15. L. Tartar, *Interpolation non linéaire et régularité*, J. Funct. Anal., **9** (1972), 469–489.
16. V.E. Zakharov and E.A. Kuznetsov, *On threedimentional solutions*, Zhurnal Eksp. Teoret. Fiz., **66** (1974), 594–597. English transl. in Soviet Phys. JETP, **39** (1974), 285–288.

Department of Mathematics, Peoples' Friendship University of Russia, Miklukho–Maklai str. 6, Moscow, 117198, Russia

E-mail address: afaminskii@sci.pfu.edu.ru